



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,853	01/16/2004	Frank Harwath	3021	1852
31424	7590	01/13/2005	EXAMINER	
BABCOCK IP LLC 24154 LAKESIDE DRIVE LAKE ZURICH, IL 60047			VU, HIEN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2833	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/707,853		HARWATH ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Hien D. Vu		2833	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 November 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2833

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of species 2, figures 3-6, claims 10-30 in paper dated 11/04/04 is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 10-15 are objected because in claim 10, line 8, "them" is unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 10-13, 15-16, 22 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Verespej et al.

The disclosure of Verespej provides a complete response to each and every element set forth in the claim. For example, figure 2 shows a connector body 21, a cylindrical outer conductor seat 22, a deformable ring 25 and a coaxial cable with a solid outer conductor 41 (see column 3, lines 29-43).

As to claim 11, a connector body bore (not labeled) coaxial with the outer conductor seat 22 as shown in figure 2.

As to claim 12, a center contact 32.

As to claims 13 and 22, an insulator 29.

As to claim 15, the connector body and contact is type N.

Art Unit: 2833

As to claim 24, the method steps of the claim substantially corresponding to the connector claim 1, therefore it is rejected under the similar rationale (??).

As to claim 25, the axial compression between the body and the crimp ring is applied upon 360 degree.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

6. (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 14, 17-21, 23 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Verespej et al. in view of Morino et al., Pitschi et al. (254) and Caleffi et al.

As to claims 4 and 23, Verespej does not show the insulator to be formed by injection molding injected through at least one opening formed in the connector body.

Morino, figures 4B-C show an insulator 47 being injected through at least one opening 42 formed in a connector body 11. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the connector of Verespej by forming the body with at least one opening for injecting molding, as taught by Morino, in order to allow easier molding.

As to claim 17, Verespej does not show the outer conductor being annular copper alloy corrugations.

Art Unit: 2833

Pitschi, figure 1 shows an outer conductor 12 being annular corrugations. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the connector of Verespej by forming the outer conductor to be annular corrugations, as taught by Pitschi, in order to achieve desired shape of the outer conductor.

As to claims 18-20, to form the cylindrical section with a specific length such as at least four times depth, ten times depth of the corrugations, at least 3 millimeters would have been an obvious matter of choice, since such modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

As to claim 21, to form the crimp ring and the solid outer conductor with materials of substantially equal thermal expansion would have been obvious to one having skill in the art, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious of choice. In re Leslin, 125 USPQ 416.

As to claims 26 and 27, Verespej does not show the compression being a die surface angled towards the cable. Caleffi, figures 6-8 show a compression 130A, B being a die surface angled towards a cable (not shown). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the connector of Verespej by providing the compression to be a die surface angled towards a cable, as taught by Caleffi, in order to provide security for the outer conductor.

Art Unit: 2833

As to claims 24 and 25, the method claims 24 and 25 substantially corresponding to the connector of claim 10, therefore they are rejected under the similar rationale.

As to claims 28-30, the features of the claims are substantially corresponding to the connector of claims 10, 16, 19 and 20, therefore they are rejected under the similar rationale.

8. Pitschi (061), Kanda et al., Jackson, Nomura, Monroe, Montena, Le et al. and Wild are cited for disclosure coaxial connectors.

Bolcar is cited for disclosure injection molding.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Hien D. Vu at telephone number 571-272-2016.

HV

1/6/05



HIEN VU
PRIMARY EXAMINER